1	CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS Ray Ballister, Jr., Esq., SBN 111282	
2	Russell Handy, Esq., SBN 195058 Phyl Grace, Esq., SBN 171771	
3	Dennis Price, SBN 279082 Mail: PO Box 262490	
4	San Diego, CA 92196-2490	
5	<u>Delivery</u> : 9845 Erma Road, Suite 300 San Diego, CA 92131	
6	(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax phylg@potterhandy.com	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
8	-	
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	Chirley Lindsoy	Case No.
13	Shirley Lindsay,	
14	Plaintiff,	Complaint For Damages And Injunctive Relief For Violations Of: American's With Disabilities
15	V.	Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act
16	<b>3161 Los Feliz Blvd., LLC,</b> a California Limited Liability	
17	Company; <b>Aram Tsolakyan;</b>	
18	Gohar Grigorian; and Does 1-10,	
19	Defendants.	
20		1
21	Plaintiff Shirley Lindsay complains of Defendants 3161 Los Feliz Blvd.,	
22	LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; Aram Tsolakyan; Gohar	
23	Grigorian; and Does 1-10 ("Defendants") and alleges as follows:	
24		
	PARTIES:	
25	1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. She suffers	
26	from arthritis (osteoarthritis of multiple joints; spinal stenosis of the lumbar	
27	spine; and essential hypertension) of her hands, knees, and hips. She uses both	
28	a cane and wheelchair for mobility.	

- ·

- 2. Defendant 3161 Los Feliz Blvd., LLC owned the real property located at or about 3161 Los Feliz Blvd., Los Angeles, California, in October 2016.
- 3. Defendant 3161 Los Feliz Blvd., LLC owns the real property located at or about 3161 Los Feliz Blvd., Los Angeles, California, currently.
- 4. Defendant Aram Tsolakyan owned the Adam Tsolakyan, DDS located at or about 3161 Los Feliz Blvd., Los Angeles, California, in October 2016.
- 5. Defendant Aram Tsolakyan owns the Adam Tsolakyan, DDS located at or about 3161 Los Feliz Blvd., Los Angeles, California, currently.
- 6. Defendant Gohar Grigorian owned the Adam Tsolakyan, DDS located at or about 3161 Los Feliz Blvd., Los Angeles, California, in October 2016.
- 7. Defendant Gohar Grigorian owns the Adam Tsolakyan, DDS ("Dental Office") located at or about 3161 Los Feliz Blvd., Los Angeles, California, currently.
- 8. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

## **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

9. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

1

## 9 10

- 11
- 12 13
- 14
- 15 16
- 17 18
- 19
- 20 21
- 22 23
- 24
- 25
- 26 27
- 28

- 10. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- 11. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

- 12. The Plaintiff went to the Dental Office in October 2016 for a dental checkup.
- 13. The Dental Office is a facility open to the public, a place of public accommodation, and a business establishment.
- 14. Parking spaces are one of the facilities, privileges and advantages offered by defendants to patrons of the Dental Office.
- 15. However, there were no parking spaces marked and reserved for persons with disabilities during any of plaintiff's visits.
- 16. Currently, there is not a single parking space marked and reserved for persons with disabilities.
- 17. On information and belief, defendants used to have an accessible parking space. Unfortunately, the defendants have allowed the parking space to fade beyond recognition or have paved over it.
- 18. Defendants do not maintain their parking lot and have no plan or policy in place to maintain their parking spaces reserved for persons with disabilities.
  - 19. Plaintiff visited the Dental Office in October 2016.
  - 20. These barriers caused Plaintiff difficulty and frustration.
- 21. Plaintiff would like to return and patronize the Dental Office but will be deterred from visiting until the defendants cure the violations.

- 22. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with disabilities.
- 23. The violations identified above are easily removed without much difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact, these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of access if complete removal were not achievable.
- 24. For example, there are numerous paint/stripe companies that will come and stripe a parking stall and access aisle and install proper signage on rapid notice, with very modest expense, sometimes as low as \$300 in fully compliance with federal and state access standards.
- 25. Plaintiff is and has been deterred from returning and patronizing the Dental Office because of her knowledge of the illegal barriers that exist. Plaintiff will, nonetheless, return to assess ongoing compliance with the ADA and will return to patronize the Dental Office as a customer once the barriers are removed.
- 26. Given the obvious and blatant violation, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are other violations and barriers on the site that relate to her disability. Plaintiff will amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this lawsuit, once she conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to her disability remedied. See *Doran v.* 7-11, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).
  - 27. Additionally, on information and belief, the plaintiff alleges that the

failure to remove these barriers was intentional because: (1) these particular barriers are intuitive and obvious; (2) the defendants exercised control and dominion over the conditions at this location and, therefore, the lack of accessible facilities was not an "accident" because had the defendants intended any other configuration, they had the means and ability to make the change.

## **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

 28. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint.

29. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are defined by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part 36,

Appendix "D."

2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6

- c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).
- 30. Any business that provides parking spaces must provide a sufficient number of handicap parking spaces. 1991 Standards § 4.1.2(5). 2010 Standards § 208. The required minimum number of handicap parking spaces is dependent on the total number of parking spaces available. *Id.* According to the 1991 Standards, if a parking lot has 1-25 spaces, it must have at least 1 accessible parking space. 1991 Standards § 4.1.2(5)(a). And 1 in every 8 of those accessible parking spaces, but not less than 1, must be a "van" accessible parking space, *i.e.*, having an eight foot access aisle. 1991 Standards § 4.1.2(5)(b). Under the 2010 Standards, a parking lot with 1-25 spaces must have at least 1 accessible space and 1 of them must be van accessible. 2010 Standards § 208.2 & § 208.2.4.
- 31. Here, the failure to provide accessible parking spaces is a violation of the ADA.
- 32. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).
- 33. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.
- 34. Given its location and options, plaintiff will continue to desire to patronize the Dental Office but she has been and will continue to be

discriminated against due to the lack of accessible facilities and, therefore, seeks injunctive relief to remove the barriers. II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ. Code § 51-53.) 35. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this complaint. 36. Because the defendants violated the plaintiff's rights under the ADA, they also violated the Unruh Civil Rights Act and are liable for damages. (Cal. Civ. Code § 51(f), 52(a).) 37. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty, discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Cal. Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-(c).) PRAYER: Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide relief as follows: 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all. 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual

damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52. Dated: March 30, 2017 **CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS**